

September 16, 2004  
Case No.: FR 000135 (7790/334)  
Serial No.: 10/015,843  
Filed: December 10, 2001  
Page 6 of 9

**REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

**Drawings** In the Final Office Action, Examiner D'Adamo objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as related to claim 14. The Applicant has cancelled claim 14 herein. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

**Claims 11-16.** In the Final Office Action, Examiner D'Adamo rejected pending claims 11-16 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR §1.114:

- A. Examiner D'Adamo rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,179,737 to *Spakman et al.*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner D'Adamo's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 11 and 12 over *Spakman*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Spakman*. To warrant this anticipation rejection of claims 11 and 12, *Spakman* must show each and every limitation of independent claim 11 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claim 11. See MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this anticipation rejection of claims 11 and 12, because *Spakman* fails to disclose and teaches away from "wherein, in the assembled position, said cover includes at least one hook extending through said opening into said main body" as recited in independent claim 11.

Specifically, as best illustrated in FIGS. 3-8, an inventive principle by *Spakman* is to connect the edges of a box 1 and a cover 3 via a stud 9. See, *Spakman* at column 1, lines 23-33. As such, the edge of cover 3 does not extend through and into box 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Spakman* is therefore respectfully requested.

September 16, 2004  
Case No.: FR 000135 (7790/334)  
Serial No.: 10/015,843  
Filed: December 10, 2001  
Page 7 of 9

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 11. Therefore, dependent claim 12 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 11. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 12 is allowable over *Spakman* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 11 being allowable over *Spakman*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Spakman* is therefore respectfully requested.

- B. Examiner D'Adamo rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,179,737 to *Spakman* et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,148,105 to *Napolitano*

Claim 13 depends from independent claim 11. Therefore, dependent claim 13 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 11. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 13 is allowable over *Spakman* in view of *Napaolitano* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 11 being allowable over *Spakman*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Spakman* in view of *Napaolitano* is therefore respectfully requested.

- C. Examiner D'Adamo rejected claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,179,737 to *Spakman* et al.

The Applicant has cancelled claims 14 and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter of claims 14 and 15. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Spakman* is therefore respectfully requested.

September 16, 2004  
Case No.: FR 000135 (7790/334)  
Serial No.: 10/015,843  
Filed: December 10, 2001  
Page 8 of 9

- D. Examiner D'Adamo rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,179,737 to *Spakman* et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,148,105 to *Napolitano*

The Applicant has cancelled claim 16 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter of claim 16. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Spakman* in view of *Napolitano* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 17-25. Claim 17 depends from independent claim 11. Therefore, dependent claim 17 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 11. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 17 is allowable over *Spakman* in view of *Napolitano* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 11 being allowable over *Spakman*. An allowance of claim 17 is therefore respectfully requested.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the art of record, particularly *Spakman*, fails to disclose or teach each and every limitation of independent claims 18 and 22. In particular, the art of record fails to teach or suggest "a cover slidable relative to said main body between an assembled position for blocking said opening and a disassembled position for allowing access to said opening" as recited in independent claim 18, and "wherein, in the assembled position, said cover includes at least one elastically deformable hook extending through said opening into said main body" and "wherein, in the locked position, said locking element extends through and into said main body and cooperates with said at least one elastically deformable hook to lock said main body and said cover in the assembled position" as recited in independent claim 22. An allowance of claims 18-25 is therefore respectfully requested.

September 16, 2004  
Case No.: FR 000135 (7790/334)  
Serial No.: 10/015,843  
Filed: December 10, 2001  
Page 9 of 9

**SUMMARY**

Examiner D'Adamo's rejections of claims 11-13 have been obviated herein by remarks supporting an allowance over *Sparkman*. Examiner D'Adamo's rejections of claims 14-16 have been obviated by the cancellation herein of claims 14-16. The Applicant has supported an allowance of new claims 17-25 over the art of record. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-13 and 17-25 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner D'Adamo is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated. September 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,  
Arnaud Fiegeo


PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
& STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff, New York 10510

---

Jack D. Slobod  
Registration No. 26,236  
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

---

  
Anthony A. Sheldon  
Registration No. 47,078  
Attorney for Applicant